



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,159	01/15/2004	Randy E. Luth	P06479US0	4834

22885 7590 02/03/2005

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.  
801 GRAND AVENUE  
SUITE 3200  
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, STEPHEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3641

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,159

Applicant(s)

LUTH, RANDY E.

Examiner

Stephen M. Johnson

Art Unit

3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3641

1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, applicant claims “an outer wall having along the substantial length of the outer wall closely spaced apart fins extending radially inwardly”. Note that element 18 is listed as applicant’s outer wall and that only annular shoulders 40 extend directly from outer wall 18. Ribs 22 extend from the inner surface of the outer wall or from what might be considered the inner wall. This creates confusion as to which of the walls ribs 22 are intended to extend from. Please clarify.

In claim 1, line 7; and in claim 12, lines 5 and 10; the terms “a gun barrel” should be claimed as (said gun barrel) if the previously claimed gun barrel is intended.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the gas tube (see claim 7) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

Art Unit: 3641

renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has not described in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill to make and use the same what non-metallic material is intended to have a melting point of at least 590 degrees F. Nor has applicant described what additives would provide the function of increasing heat stabilization, heat aging resistance, and lubrication.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant has not included what non-metallic material is intended to have a melting point of at least 590 degrees F. Nor has

Art Unit: 3641

applicant described what additive or additives would provide an increased heat stabilization, heat aging resistance, and/or lubrication.

6. Applicant cites U.S. patent 3,826,589 as providing support for this claim language. Since this prior art patent was not incorporated by reference in the application as originally filed, it cannot now be relied upon to provide the essential subject matter required to support the claim language of claim 5.

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haskell (339).

Haskell discloses a finned handguard assembly comprising:

- |  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| a) a pair of half sections;                            | 16, 18              |
| b) a gun barrel;                                       | 2                   |
| c) an outer wall having closely spaced apart fins; and | see fig. 7          |
| d) a heat conducting material (aluminum).              | page 2, lines 37-38 |

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3641

10. Claims 2-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haskill (339) in view of Reaume.

Haskill (339) applies as previously recited. However, undisclosed is barrel enclosing material that is plastic or non-metallic. Reaume teaches a barrel enclosing material that is plastic or non-metallic (col. 6, lines 34-36). Applicant is substituting one material type of barrel enclosing material for another in an analogous art setting as explicitly encouraged by both the primary (see page 2, lines 35-40 of Haskill) reference and the secondary (col. 6, lines 34-39 of Reaume) reference. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Reaume to the Haskill (339) handguard and have a handguard made of a different type of material.

11. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tatro (875).

Tatro (875) discloses a finned handguard assembly comprising:

- |  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| a) a pair of half sections;                            | 31                  |
| b) a gun barrel;                                       | fig. 2              |
| c) an outer wall having closely spaced apart fins; and | 38                  |
| d) a heat conducting material (plastic).               | col. 2, lines 58-62 |

12. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatro (875) in view of Howard et al. (372 B1).

Tatro (875) applies as previously recited. However, undisclosed is a firearm stock material that is a glass fiber reinforced polyamide with additives to increase stability. Howard (372 B1) teaches a firearm stock material that is a glass fiber reinforced polyamide with

Art Unit: 3641

additives to increase stability (col. 3, lines 44-66). Applicant is substituting one material type of stock material for another as explicitly encouraged by Tatro (875) (see col. 2, lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Howard et al. (372 B1) to the Tatro (875) handguard assembly and have a handguard assembly made of a different type of material composition.

13. Claims 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-10 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3641

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Johnson whose telephone number is 703-306-4158.

The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-4177.



STEPHEN M. JOHNSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Stephen M. Johnson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3641

SMJ  
February 1, 2005